

REGULARITY THEORY AND EXTENSION PROBLEM FOR FRACTIONAL NONLOCAL PARABOLIC EQUATIONS AND THE MASTER EQUATION

PABLO RAÚL STINGA AND JOSÉ L. TORREA

ABSTRACT. We develop the regularity theory for solutions to space-time nonlocal equations driven by fractional powers of the heat operator

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)^s u(t, x) = f(t, x), \quad \text{for } 0 < s < 1.$$

This equation is of order s in time and $2s$ in space. It plays for space-time nonlocal equations like the generalized master equation the same role as the fractional Laplacian for nonlocal in space equations. We obtain a pointwise integro-differential formula for $(\partial_t - \Delta)^s u(t, x)$ as well as parabolic maximum principles. An extension problem to characterize this nonlocal equation with a local degenerate parabolic equation is proved. Then we show parabolic interior and boundary Harnack inequalities. Hölder and Schauder estimates for the space-time Poisson problem are deduced via a novel characterization of parabolic Hölder spaces. Some crucial tools in the analysis are the language of semigroups and the Cauchy Integral Theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

We develop the study of regularity and fine properties of solutions $u = u(t, x)$ to space-time nonlocal equations driven by the fractional powers of the heat operator $H = \partial_t - \Delta$,

$$H^s u \equiv (\partial_t - \Delta)^s u = f, \quad \text{for } 0 < s < 1,$$

in the variables $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. This can be regarded as the most basic space-time nonlocal equation of order s in time and $2s$ in space. The fractional powers of the heat operator play for these types of equations the parallel role as that of the fractional powers of the Laplacian in the general theory of integro-differential equations. In particular, the equation $H^s u = f$ is an instance of the master equation, see (1.1). The master equation is central in the theory of continuous time random walks, see Caffarelli–Silvestre [4] and Metzler–Klafter [13].

In this paper a systematic analysis of fine regularity properties is carried out. We find the pointwise formula for $H^s u$ and its inverse $H^{-s} f$ (fundamental solution) and prove maximum principles. We obtain an extension problem in the spirit of Caffarelli–Silvestre [3] and Stinga–Torrea [22] that characterizes this nonlocal operator through a local PDE. The extension equation turns out to be a parabolic degenerate equation in one more variable. Then interior and boundary Harnack inequalities of parabolic type are deduced. Moreover, we show parabolic Hölder and Schauder estimates.

Apart from their immediate interest in applications, see [4, 13], some of our results can also be considered as a non trivial upgrade for the heat operator of the (elliptic) papers [3, 22, 23]. We present here some novel and crucial patterns that allow us to get the new interesting results mentioned above in the nonlocal parabolic context. In particular, we use tools such as the Cauchy Integral Theorem and analytic continuation in combination with the language of semigroups and PDE techniques. Notice that the spectrum of the heat operator is complex valued. Moreover, our method gives a new characterization of parabolic Hölder spaces.

Let us begin by defining the fractional powers of the heat operator. For $0 < s < 1$, the fractional heat operator $H^s u(t, x)$ of a function $u = u(t, x) : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 1$, is given in a natural way with

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 35R09, 35R11, 58J35. Secondary: 26A33, 35B65, 47G20.

Key words and phrases. Nonlocal space-time equation, master equation, fractional heat operator, language of semigroups, extension problem, Harnack inequality, Hölder regularity.

The authors were supported by grant MTM2011-28149-C02-01 from Spanish Government.

the Fourier transform as

$$\widehat{H^s u}(\rho, \xi) = (i\rho + |\xi|^2)^s \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi),$$

for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Observe that, unlike the case of the Laplacian, the Fourier multiplier of the heat operator H is the complex number $i\rho + |\xi|^2$. Hence a first goal is to give a correct meaning to the s -power of this complex number. To obtain a pointwise formula for $H^s u(t, x)$ in the space-time variables (t, x) , one would be tempted to try to compute the inverse Fourier transform in the definition above. We overcome these difficulties by using complex variable theory together with the language of semigroups. In this way we avoid the computation of the inverse Fourier transform.

Theorem 1.1 (Pointwise formula). *Let u be a function in the parabolic Hölder space $C_{t,x}^{s+\delta, 2s+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, for some $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ (see Section 2 for definitions). Then for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$(1.1) \quad H^s u(t, x) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u(t, x) - u(t - \tau, x - z)) K_s(\tau, z) dz d\tau,$$

where

$$K_s(\tau, z) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{n/2} |\Gamma(-s)|} \cdot \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{n/2+1+s}},$$

for $\tau > 0$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Here Γ denotes the Gamma function. Moreover, for some $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$,

$$(1) \quad K_s(\tau, z) \geq \frac{\lambda}{|z|^{n+2+2s}}, \text{ when } \tau \sim |z|^2,$$

$$(2) \quad K_s(\tau, z) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|z|^{n+2+2s} + \tau^{(n+2+2s)/2}}, \text{ for every } z \neq 0.$$

Our pointwise formula in (1.1) shows that $H^s u(t, x) = f(t, x)$ is indeed a master equation [4, 13]. In particular, estimates (1) and (2) for the kernel $K_s(\tau, z)$ above are the same that Caffarelli and Silvestre assume in [4] for $\sigma = 2s$ and $\beta = 2$. Therefore, we can regard the equation $H^s u = f$ as the most basic model for a space-time nonlocal equation, in particular, for the master equation.

Remark 1.2 (Dirichlet problem – Boundary condition). Notice from (1.1) that in order to compute $H^s u(t, x)$ we need to know the values of $u(\tau, z)$ for every $\tau \leq t$ (the past) and every $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the natural Dirichlet problem for H^s takes the form

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} H^s u = f, & \text{in } (T_0, T_1] \times \Omega, \\ u = g, & \text{in } [(-\infty, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n] \cup [(T_0, T_1] \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)], \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $T_0 < T_1$ are real numbers and $f(t, x)$ and $g(t, x)$ are prescribed functions in their respective domains.

Remark 1.3 (Scaling). It follows from (1.1) that if $u_\lambda(t, x) = u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$, $\lambda > 0$, then we have the natural fractional parabolic scaling

$$(1.3) \quad (H^s u_\lambda)(t, x) = \lambda^{2s} (H^s u)(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x).$$

If a function u does not depend on t then $Hu = -\Delta u$, while if it does not depend on x then $Hu = \partial_t u$. In a similar way we obtain

Corollary 1.4 (Separated variables cases). *Let $u \in C_{t,x}^{s+\delta, 2s+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, for some $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. If u does not depend on t then*

$$H^s u(t, x) = (-\Delta)^s u(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

the fractional Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^n$. If u does not depend on x then

$$H^s u(t, x) = (\partial_t)^s u(t) = \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s)|} \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{u(t) - u(\tau)}{(t - \tau)^{1+s}} d\tau, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

the Marchaud/Caputo fractional derivative of order s .

The parabolic nonlocal maximum principle takes the following form.

Theorem 1.5 (Maximum principle). *Let $u \in C_{t,x}^{s+\delta, 2s+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, for some $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. Suppose that*

- (1) $u(t_0, x_0) = 0$ for some $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, and
 (2) $u(t, x) \geq 0$ for $t \leq t_0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Then

$$H^s u(t_0, x_0) \leq 0.$$

Moreover, $H^s u(t_0, x_0) = 0$ if and only if $u(t, x) = 0$ for $t \leq t_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

As a consequence, we have a comparison principle and the uniqueness of solutions to the Dirichlet problem (1.2).

Corollary 1.6 (Comparison principle – Uniqueness). *Let Ω be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $T_0 < T_1$ be two real numbers. Suppose that u and w are regular enough to compute $H^s u$ and $H^s w$ in $(T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ with the pointwise formula (1.1). If*

$$\begin{cases} H^s u \geq H^s w, & \text{in } (T_0, T_1] \times \Omega, \\ u \geq w, & \text{in } [(-\infty, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \cup [(T_0, T_1] \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)], \end{cases}$$

then $u \geq w$ in $(-\infty, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, we have uniqueness of the Dirichlet problem (1.2).

We characterize the fractional heat operator with an extension problem in the spirit of Caffarelli–Silvestre and Stinga–Torrea. The extension equation turns out to be a parabolic degenerate equation with Muckenhoupt A_2 -weight. For the definition of $e^{-\tau H} u(t, x)$ see Section 2.

Theorem 1.7 (Extension problem). *Let $u \in \text{Dom}(H^s)$, that is, let u be a function in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ such that $(\rho + |\xi|^2)^s \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. A solution $U = U(t, x, y)$ to the parabolic extension problem*

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t U = \Delta U + \frac{1-2s}{y} U_y + U_{yy}, & \text{for } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, y > 0, \\ U(t, x, 0) = u(t, x), & \text{for } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \end{cases}$$

where the boundary data is taken in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, is given by

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} U(t, x, y) &= \frac{y^{2s}}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} e^{-\tau H} u(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-r} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4r} H} u(t, x) \frac{dr}{r^{1-s}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4r)} e^{-r H} (H^s u)(t, x) \frac{dr}{r^{1-s}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $y \geq 0$. We can also write the Poisson formula

$$(1.6) \quad U(t, x, y) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P_y^s(\tau, z) u(t - \tau, x - z) dz d\tau,$$

where the fractional Poisson kernel $P_y^s(\tau, z)$ is defined for $\tau > 0$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y > 0$ by

$$(1.7) \quad P_y^s(\tau, z) = \frac{1}{4^{n/2+s} \pi^{n/2} \Gamma(s)} \cdot \frac{y^{2s}}{\tau^{n/2+1+s}} e^{-(y^2+|z|^2)/(4\tau)}.$$

Moreover,

$$(1.8) \quad - \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{U(t, x, y) - U(t, x, 0)}{y^{2s}} = \frac{|\Gamma(-s)|}{4^s \Gamma(s)} H^s u(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2s} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^{1-2s} U_y(t, x, y).$$

All identities above are understood in the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ sense.

Theorem 1.8 (Fundamental solution for the extension problem). *Let $f = f(t, x)$ be a smooth function with compact support. Define*

$$(1.9) \quad G_s(\tau, z, y) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)(4\pi)^{n/2}} \cdot \frac{e^{-(|z|^2+y^2)/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{n/2+1-s}},$$

for $(\tau, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $y > 0$. Then the function

$$\mathcal{U}(t, x, y) := \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G_s(\tau, z, y) f(t - \tau, x - z) dz d\tau,$$

is a classical solution of the extension equation (1.4) and

$$-\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{U}(t, x, y) - \mathcal{U}(t, x, 0)}{y^{2s}} = \frac{|\Gamma(-s)|}{4^s \Gamma(s)} f(0, 0) = -\frac{1}{2s} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^{1-2s} \partial_y \mathcal{U}(t, x, y).$$

Remark 1.9 (Relation between fundamental solution and Poisson kernel for the extension problem). In a parallel way as in the elliptic case of [3, 22], the Poisson kernel (1.7) is given by the conormal derivative of the fundamental solution (1.9). Indeed,

$$-\frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{4^{s-1/2}\Gamma(s)} y^{1-2(1-s)} \partial_y G_{1-s}(\tau, z, y) = P_y^s(\tau, z).$$

Remark 1.10 (Divergence and non divergence structures). The extension equation in (1.4) can be written in divergence form as

$$\partial_t U = y^{-(1-2s)} \operatorname{div}_{x,y} (y^{1-2s} \nabla_{x,y} U).$$

This is a degenerate equation with Muckenhoupt A_2 -weight given by $\omega(x, y) = y^{1-2s}$. Degenerate parabolic equations with these types of weights have been studied by Chiarenza–Serapioni [6] and Gutiérrez–Wheeden [7]. We can also write the extension equation in non divergence form via the change of variables $z = (y/(2s))^{2s}$ as

$$(1.10) \quad \partial_t U = \Delta U + z^{2-1/s} U_{zz}, \quad z > 0.$$

In this case we get $y^{1-2s} U_y = U_z$, so the Neumann boundary condition (1.8) reads

$$-U_z(t, x, 0) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{4^{s-1/2}\Gamma(s)} H^s u(t, x).$$

The same change of variables applied to (1.9) allows to compute the fundamental solution of the non divergence form extension equation (1.10).

Let us recall the parabolic Harnack inequality for caloric functions. If v is a solution to

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v - \Delta v = 0, & \text{in } R := (0, 2) \times B_2, \\ v \geq 0, & \text{in } R, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sup_{R^-} v \leq c \inf_{R^+} v,$$

where $R^- = (1/4, 1/2) \times B_1$, $R^+ = (3/4, 1) \times B_1$. The constant c above depends only on dimension and the distances between R^- , R^+ and R . This result was discovered independently by Pini [15] and Hadamard [8]. For the Harnack inequality for uniformly parabolic equations in divergence form see Moser [14], while for degenerate parabolic equations in divergence form see Chiarenza–Serapioni [6], also Gutiérrez–Wheeden [7] and Ishige [9].

With the extension problem at hand we can prove the parabolic Harnack inequality for fractional caloric functions.

Theorem 1.11 (Parabolic Harnack inequality). *If $u = u(t, x) \in \operatorname{Dom}(H^s)$ is a solution to*

$$\begin{cases} H^s u = 0, & \text{in } R = (0, 2) \times B_2, \\ u \geq 0, & \text{in } (-\infty, 2) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sup_{R^-} u \leq c \inf_{R^+} u,$$

where c depends only on dimension, s and the geometry. In particular, u is locally C^α in (t, x) in the interior of R , for some universal $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Remark 1.12 (Non negativity condition in Harnack inequality). Observe that in the local case of the heat equation (1.11) we just need the solution v to be nonnegative in R . In the case of the fractional heat operator, a sufficient condition for the Harnack inequality is $u \geq 0$ everywhere in $(-\infty, 2) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. But, as it happens also in the case of the fractional Laplacian, this condition is not strictly necessary. Indeed, in our proof (see Section 5) we only need U in the extension problem (1.4) to be nonnegative (see (1.6)) *above* the rectangle R . A parallel remark applies to the parabolic boundary Harnack inequality contained in Theorem 1.13.

Next, let us recall the boundary Harnack inequality for caloric functions, see Kemper [10]. Let Ω be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and suppose that $0 \in \partial\Omega$. We assume that the boundary of Ω inside the ball B_2 can be described as the graph of a Lipschitz function ψ on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ with Lipschitz constant, say, 1, in the e_n direction. More precisely, we assume that

$$\Omega \cap B_2 = \{(x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n > \psi(x')\} \cap B_2,$$

and that $\partial\Omega \cap B_2 = \{(x', \psi(x')) : x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\} \cap B_2$. Suppose that $v = v(t, x)$ is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - \Delta v = 0, & \text{in } (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \\ v \geq 0, & \text{in } (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$v \text{ vanishes continuously on } (-2, 2) \times (\partial\Omega \cap B_2).$$

Let (t_0, x_0) be a fixed point in $(-2, 2) \times \Omega$ such that $t_0 > 1$. Then

$$\sup_{(-1, 1) \times (\Omega \cap B_1)} v(t, x) \leq C v(t_0, x_0).$$

The constant $C > 0$ above depends only on dimension and the chosen geometry. For the boundary Harnack inequality for uniformly parabolic equations in divergence form see Salsa [17], while for degenerate parabolic equations in divergence form see Ishige [9].

Theorem 1.13 (Boundary Harnack inequality). *Consider Ω with the geometry described in the previous paragraph. Let $u = u(t, x) \in \text{Dom}(H^s)$ be a solution to*

$$\begin{cases} H^s u = 0, & \text{in } (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, & \text{in } (-\infty, 2) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$u \text{ vanishes continuously on } (-2, 2) \times ((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \cap B_2).$$

Let (t_0, x_0) be a fixed point in $(-2, 2) \times \Omega$ such that $t_0 > 1$. Then

$$\sup_{(-1, 1) \times (\Omega \cap B_1)} u(t, x) \leq C u(t_0, x_0),$$

where C depends only on dimension, s and the geometry.

From the estimates for the kernel K_s in Theorem 1.1, the fractional parabolic scaling (1.3) and Corollary 1.4, we see that H^s is an operator of order s in time and $2s$ in space. This observation becomes more evident with the following global Hölder estimates.

Theorem 1.14 (Hölder estimates). *If $u \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for $2s < \alpha$ then $H^s u \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2-s, \alpha-2s}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with the estimate*

$$\|H^s u\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2-s, \alpha-2s}} \leq C_{n,s} \|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}}.$$

In the following result we show how to solve the global nonlocal Poisson problem

$$(1.12) \quad H^s u = f, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

Theorem 1.15 (Poisson problem – Fundamental solution for H^s). *Let $f = f(t, x)$ be an $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ function. Then an $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ solution $u = u(t, x)$ to (1.12) is given by*

$$u(t, x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\tau H} f(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-s}} = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(t - \tau, x - z) K_{-s}(\tau, z) dz d\tau,$$

where

$$K_{-s}(\tau, z) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{n/2} \Gamma(s)} \cdot \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{n/2+1-s}},$$

for $\tau > 0$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, for some $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda$ we have the estimates

- (1) $K_{-s}(\tau, z) \geq \frac{\lambda}{|z|^{n+2-2s}}$, when $\tau \sim |z|^2$,
- (2) $K_{-s}(\tau, z) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|z|^{n+2-2s} + \tau^{(n+2-2s)/2}}$, for every $z \neq 0$.

Remark 1.16 (Separated variables in the Poisson problem). If in Theorem 1.15 the right hand side f does not depend on t then u is nothing but the convolution of f with the fundamental solution of the fractional Laplacian $u = (-\Delta)^{-s} f$. When f does not depend on x then

$$u(t) = (\partial_t)^{-s} f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{f(\tau)}{(t - \tau)^{1-s}} d\tau,$$

that is, u is the Weyl fractional integral of f , see [2, 18]. Observe that $(\partial_t)^{-s}$ is the inverse of the Marchaud/Caputo fractional derivative appearing in Corollary 1.4. In fact, a Fractional Fundamental Theorem of Calculus on quite general one-sided weighted Lebesgue spaces can be proved, see [2].

The following Schauder estimates are complementary to the Hölder estimates of Theorem 1.14. The definitions of Hölder and Zygmund spaces are contained in Sections 2 and 6, respectively.

Theorem 1.17 (Schauder estimates). *Let u be a solution to $H^s u = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ as described in Theorem 1.15.*

- (1) *Let $f \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for some $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.*

(a) *If $\alpha + 2s$ is not an integer then u is in $C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2+s,\alpha+2s}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2+s,\alpha+2s}} \leq C(\|f\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

(b) *If $\alpha + 2s$ is an integer then u is in the parabolic Hölder-Zygmund space $\Lambda_{t,x}^{\alpha/2+s,\alpha+2s}$ with the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda_{t,x}^{\alpha/2+s,\alpha+2s}} \leq C(\|f\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

The constants C in (a) and (b) depend only on dimension, α and s .

- (2) *Let $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.*

(i) *If $0 < s < 1/2$ then $u \in C_{t,x}^{s,2s}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{s,2s}} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

(ii) *If $s = 1/2$ then u is in the parabolic Hölder-Zygmund space $\Lambda_{t,x}^{1/2,1}$ with the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda_{t,x}^{1/2,1}} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

(iii) *If $1/2 < s < 1$ then $u \in C_{t,x}^{s,1+(2s-1)}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with the estimate*

$$\|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{s,1+(2s-1)}} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

The constants C in (i), (ii) and (iii) depend only on dimension and s .

The Schauder estimates in Theorem 1.17 may be already known in the context of boundedness of pseudo differential operators in Hölder spaces, see Madych–Rivière [12]. One of our main novelties here is a characterization of the parabolic Hölder and Zygmund spaces in terms of the Poisson semigroup generated by the heat operator H , see Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 in Section 6, which are results of independent interest. Their elliptic analogs can be found in Stein [20]. This description permits us to use the semigroup formulas for $H^s u$ and $H^{-s} f$ in (6.2) and (6.5) to derive the Hölder and Schauder estimates. Observe that if f does not depend on t then we recover the Schauder estimates for the fractional Laplacian [5, 19], while if f does not depend on x then we get Schauder estimates for the Marchaud/Caputo fractional derivative, see also [18]. For the local case $s = 1$, parabolic Schauder estimates can be found, for example, in Krylov [11, Chapter 8].

As we said before, one of the main purposes of this paper is to establish the regularity theory for the fractional nonlocal parabolic equation $(\partial_t - \Delta)^s u = f$ under the light given by the combination of the Cauchy Integral Theorem, the language of semigroups and PDE techniques. These ideas avoid the heavy use of the special symmetries of the Fourier transform as in more classical approaches. Thus it will be clear to the reader that our method can be applied to more general equations like

$$(\partial_t - L)^s u(t, x) = f(t, x),$$

where L is an elliptic operator in a domain Ω including boundary conditions. Finally, it is evident that the results of this paper will be useful to establish regularity estimates of nonlinear nonlocal space-time equations. Applications in these cases will appear elsewhere.

Some related fractional powers associated to space-time derivative operators can be found in the exhaustive monograph [18], see also [1].

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of all the results presented in this Introduction.

2. THE POINTWISE FORMULA

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.4.

It is known by now that from the semigroup description of a fractional operator it is possible to obtain its pointwise formula. This idea was first introduced and exploited to a large extent in [21, 22, 23], and more recently in [2, 5, 16], in the case of elliptic equations. In our present situation, we start with the following absolutely convergent integral involving the Gamma function:

$$(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^s = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau(i\rho + |\xi|^2)} - 1) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

The identity above is valid for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < s < 1$. Indeed, it follows from the case $\rho = 0$, $|\xi| = 1$, by using the Cauchy Integral Theorem and the analytic continuation of the function $\tau \mapsto \tau^s$ from the half line $[0, \infty)$ to the half plane $\Re(z) > 0$. Let us take a function $u = u(t, x)$ such that $(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^s \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. Then

$$(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^s \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s)} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_\varepsilon^{1/\varepsilon} (e^{-\tau(i\rho + |\xi|^2)} \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi) - \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

The limit above is taken in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. For functions $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ we have the Fourier transform identity

$$\widehat{e^{-\tau H} u}(\rho, \xi) = e^{-\tau(i\rho + |\xi|^2)} \widehat{u}(\rho, \xi).$$

Then by Plancherel Theorem,

$$(2.1) \quad H^s u(t, x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau H} u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}},$$

in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. Observe that $v(\tau, t, x) = e^{-\tau H} u(t, x)$ is an L^2 solution to

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_\tau v = -Hv, & \text{for } \tau > 0, (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \\ v(0, t, x) = u(t, x), & \text{for } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} v(\tau, t, x) &= e^{-\tau H} u(t, x) = e^{-\tau \partial_t} e^{\tau \Delta} u(t, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-|x-z|^2/(4\tau)} u(t-\tau, z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

for $\tau > 0$, $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Definition 2.1 (Parabolic Hölder spaces, see also [11]). Let $u = u(t, x)$ be a bounded continuous function in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

- (1) Suppose that $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Then u is in the parabolic Hölder space $C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ if there exists a positive constant C such that

$$|u(t-\tau, x-z) - u(t, x)| \leq C(|\tau|^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha,$$

for every $t, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The least constant C for which the inequality above is true is denoted by $[u]_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}}$. The norm is given in the usual way.

- (2) For $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ we say that u is in the space $C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) = C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, 1+(\alpha-1)}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ if u is $\alpha/2$ -Hölder continuous in t uniformly in x and its gradient $\nabla_x u$ is $(\alpha-1)$ -Hölder continuous in x uniformly in t .
- (3) In general, for any $\alpha > 0$, we say that u is in the space

$$C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) = C_{t,x}^{[\alpha/2] + (\alpha/2 - [\alpha/2]), [\alpha] + (\alpha - [\alpha])}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}),$$

if u has $[\alpha/2]$ time derivatives $(\alpha/2 - [\alpha/2])$ -Hölder continuous uniformly in x and $[\alpha]$ space derivatives $(\alpha - [\alpha])$ -Hölder continuous uniformly in t . Here $[\alpha]$ denotes the integer part of α .

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $u \in C_{t,x}^{s+\delta, 2s+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, for some $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. As $e^{-\tau H} 1 \equiv 1$, from (2.1) and (2.3) we can write

$$H^s u(t, x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-s)} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} (u(t-\tau, x-z) - u(t, x)) dz \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

It is clear that for $\tau > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{n/2+1+s}} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|z|^{n+2+2s} + \tau^{(n+2+2s)/2}},$$

for some positive constant Λ , so estimate (2) in the statement follows. Also, (1) is clearly true. By using the regularity of u , the integral above is absolutely convergent near the singularity. Moreover, the integral converges at infinity because u is bounded. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Suppose that u does not depend on t . Then, by using the change of variables $r = |z|^2/(4\tau)$ (see the details in [21, 22]),

$$\begin{aligned} H^s u(t, x) &= \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s)|} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u(x) - u(x-z)) \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} dz \\ &= \frac{4^s \Gamma(n/2 + s)}{\pi^{n/2} |\Gamma(-s)|} \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(x-z)}{|z|^{n+2s}} dz = (-\Delta)^s u(x), \end{aligned}$$

where P.V. means that the integral in dz is taken in the principal value sense. On the other hand, if u does not depend on x then

$$\begin{aligned} H^s u(t, x) &= \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s)|} \int_0^\infty (u(t) - u(t-\tau)) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} dz \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Gamma(-s)|} \int_0^\infty \frac{u(t) - u(t-\tau)}{\tau^{1+s}} d\tau = (\partial_t)^s u(t), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. $\square$

Remark 2.2 (Pointwise formula in the general case). Let $u = u(t, x)$ be a function such that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(t - \tau, z)| \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{(1 + \tau^{n/2+1+s})} dz d\tau < \infty,$$

for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If u satisfies the parabolic Hölder condition $C_{t,x}^{s+\delta, 2s+\varepsilon}$, for some $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ in some open set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then it can be seen that the pointwise formula for $H^s u(t, x)$ in (1.1) is valid for every $(t, x) \in Q$. This follows by an standard approximation procedure, see [19, 21, 23]. Details are left to the interested reader.

3. MAXIMUM AND COMPARISON PRINCIPLES – UNIQUENESS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. If u satisfies (1) and (2) then it follows from the pointwise formula (1.1) and the non negativity of the kernel that $H^s u(t_0, x_0) \leq 0$. Moreover, if $H^s u(t_0, x_0) = 0$, then $u(t, x)$ has to be zero for all $t \leq t_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1. *Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $T_0 < T_1$ be two real numbers.*

(1) *Suppose that u solves*

$$\begin{cases} H^s u = f, & \text{in } (T_0, T_1] \times \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{in } D := [(-\infty, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n] \cup [(T_0, T_1) \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)]. \end{cases}$$

If $f \geq 0$ in $(T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ then $u \geq 0$ everywhere in $(-\infty, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

(2) *If $H^s u \leq 0$ in $(T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ and $u \leq 0$ in $D = [(-\infty, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n] \cup [(T_0, T_1) \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)]$ then*

$$\sup_{t < T_1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x) = \sup_D u(t, x).$$

(3) *If $H^s u \geq 0$ in $(T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ and $u \geq 0$ in $D = [(-\infty, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n] \cup [(T_0, T_1) \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega)]$ then*

$$\inf_{t < T_1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x) = \inf_D u(t, x).$$

Proof. For (1), by contradiction, suppose that there is a point $(t_0, x_0) \in (T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ where u attains a negative minimum over $(-\infty, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, by Theorem 1.5, $H^s u(t_0, x_0) \leq 0$. Now we have two cases. If $H^s u(t_0, x_0) = 0$ then necessarily $u(t, x) = u(t_0, x_0) < 0$ for all $t \leq t_0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, contradicting the hypothesis that $u(t, x) = 0$ in D . The case $H^s u(t_0, x_0) < 0$ also leads to a contradiction because, by assumption, $f(t_0, x_0) \geq 0$. Therefore $u \geq 0$ in $(-\infty, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Notice that (3) follows from (2) by considering $-u$. For (2), again by contradiction, suppose that $\sup_{t < T_1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x)$ is not attained in D . Then there exists $(t_0, x_0) \in (T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$ such that $u(t_0, x_0)$ is a maximum of u over $(-\infty, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, by Theorem 1.5, $H^s u(t_0, x_0) \geq 0$. The case $H^s u(t_0, x_0) > 0$ contradicts the fact that $H^s u \leq 0$ in $(T_0, T_1] \times \Omega$. Now if $H^s u(t_0, x_0) = 0$ then, by Theorem 1.5, $u(t, x) = u(t_0, x_0)$ for all $t \leq t_0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This implies that $\sup_{t < T_1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n} u(t, x)$ is attained in D , again a contradiction with our initial assumption. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.6. The statement follows by applying Lemma 3.1(3) to $u - w$. The uniqueness is immediate. $\square$

4. THE PARABOLIC EXTENSION PROBLEM

In this section we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Since U is given explicitly, we just have to make sure that it satisfies the equation, it attains the boundary data and verifies the Neumann boundary condition.

We first show that all the expressions for U given in the statement are equivalent. As the integral $\int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}}$ is absolutely convergent, we can argue as we did in formula (2.1). In particular, we can apply Fourier transform. Then the second identity in (1.5) follows from the first one by the change of variables $r = y^2/(4\tau)$, while the third one follows again from the first one but now via the

formal change of variables $r = y^2/(4\tau H)$. Finally, the Poisson formula (1.6) is a consequence of the first identity for U in (1.5) by writing $e^{-\tau H}u(t, x)$ with a kernel as in (2.3).

Secondly, let us prove that U satisfies all the properties of the statement in the L^2 sense. Indeed, from the first identity for U in (1.5) and using the fact that $e^{-\tau H}u$ solves (2.2), by integrating by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \Delta)U &= \frac{y^{2s}}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} H(e^{-\tau H}u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} \\ &= -\frac{y^{2s}}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} \partial_\tau (e^{-\tau H}u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} \\ &= \frac{y^{2s}}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty \partial_\tau \left[\frac{e^{-y^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{1+s}} \right] e^{-\tau H}u(t, x) d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1-2s}{y} \partial_y + \partial_{yy} \right) \left[\frac{y^{2s} e^{-y^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{1+s}} \right] e^{-\tau H}u(t, x) d\tau \\ &= \left(\frac{1-2s}{y} \partial_y + \partial_{yy} \right) U. \end{aligned}$$

From the second identity for U in (1.5) and by using that $e^{-\tau H}u|_{\tau=0} = u$ and the definition of the Gamma function, it is obvious that U satisfies the boundary condition $U(t, x, y) = u(t, x)$. To prove the first Neumann boundary condition in (1.8), consider the first identity for U in (1.5). It is easy to check that, for every $y > 0$,

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{y^{2s}}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} = 1.$$

Then

$$\frac{U(t, x, y) - U(t, x, 0)}{y^{2s}} = \frac{1}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} (e^{-\tau H}u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}},$$

which, as $y \rightarrow 0^+$, clearly converges to (see (2.1))

$$\frac{1}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau H}u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}} = \frac{\Gamma(-s)}{4^s \Gamma(s)} H^s u(t, x).$$

In a similar way, we use the derivative with respect to y of (4.1) to write

$$y^{1-2s} \partial_y U(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{4^s \Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty \left(2s - \frac{y^2}{2\tau} \right) e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} (e^{-\tau H}u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

Then the second Neumann condition in (1.8) follows. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.8. That $\mathcal{U}(t, x, y)$ solves the equation in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ can be seen just by a direct computation via Fourier transform. If f is good enough the performed computation is classical. $\square$

5. INTERIOR AND BOUNDARY PARABOLIC HARNACK INEQUALITIES

In this section we prove Theorems 1.11 and 1.13. We need the following preliminary result.

Lemma 5.1 (Reflection extension). *Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, (T_0, T_1) an open interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and $Y_0 > 0$. Suppose that a function $U = U(t, x, y) : (T_0, T_1) \times \Omega \times [0, Y_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$\partial_t U = y^{-(1-2s)} \operatorname{div}_{x,y} (y^{1-2s} \nabla_{x,y} U),$$

for $(t, x) \in (T_0, T_1) \times \Omega$, $0 < y < Y_0$, with

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y^{1-2s} U_y(t, x, y) = 0,$$

for every $(t, x) \in (T_0, T_1) \times \Omega$, in the weak sense. Then the even extension of U in y defined by

$$(5.1) \quad \tilde{U}(t, x, y) := U(t, x, |y|), \quad \text{for } y \in (-Y_0, Y_0),$$

verifies the degenerate parabolic equation

$$(5.2) \quad \partial_t \tilde{U} = |y|^{-(1-2s)} \operatorname{div}_{x,y}(|y|^{1-2s} \nabla_{x,y} \tilde{U}),$$

in the weak sense in $(T_0, T_1) \times \Omega \times (-Y_0, Y_0)$.

Proof. The fact that U satisfies the equation in the weak sense means that for every smooth test function $\varphi = \varphi(t, x, y)$ with compact support in $(T_0, T_1) \times \Omega \times [0, Y_0]$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_0^{Y_0} U(\partial_t \varphi) y^{1-2s} dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_0^{Y_0} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} (\nabla_{x,y} U)(\nabla_{x,y} \varphi) y^{1-2s} dt dy dx.$$

In particular,

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} y^{1-2s} U_y \varphi dt dx = 0.$$

Let ϕ be a smooth test function with compact support in $(T_0, T_1) \times \Omega \times (-Y_0, Y_0)$. For any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_{-Y_0}^{Y_0} (\nabla_{x,y} \tilde{U})(\nabla_{x,y} \phi) |y|^{1-2s} dy dt dx = \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_{|y|>\delta} \operatorname{div}_{x,y}(|y|^{1-2s} \phi \nabla_{x,y} \tilde{U}) dy dt dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{|y|>\delta} \tilde{U}(\partial_t \phi) |y|^{1-2s} dy dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_{|y|<\delta} (\nabla_{x,y} \tilde{U})(\nabla_{x,y} \phi) |y|^{1-2s} dy dt dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} (|y|^{1-2s} \phi \tilde{U}_y)|_{y=\delta} dt dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{|y|>\delta} \tilde{U}(\partial_t \phi) |y|^{1-2s} dy dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_{|y|<\delta} (\nabla_{x,y} \tilde{U})(\nabla_{x,y} \phi) |y|^{1-2s} dy dt dx. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we see that the first and third integrals above tend to zero because of (5.3) and the local integrability of the integrand, respectively. Thus, $\tilde{U}$ is a weak solution to (5.2). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Let u be as in the statement and consider its extension U for $y > 0$ as in Theorem 1.7. Notice that, since $u(t, x) \geq 0$ for $t < 2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by (1.6)–(1.7) we have $U = U(t, x, y) \geq 0$ for all $0 < t < 2$, $x \in B_2$ and $y > 0$. Let $\tilde{U}$ be the reflection of U as given by (5.1). Then by Lemma 5.1, $\tilde{U}$ is a nonnegative weak solution to the degenerate parabolic equation (5.2). For this equation the Harnack inequality of Chiarenza–Serapioni [6] (see also Gutiérrez–Wheeden [7], Ishige [9]) applies. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(t,x) \in R^-} u(t, x) &= \sup_{(t,x) \in R^-} U(t, x, 0) \leq \sup_{(t,x,y) \in R^- \times (-1,1)} U(t, x, y) \\ &\leq c \inf_{(t,x,y) \in R^+ \times (-1,1)} U(t, x, y) \leq c \inf_{(t,x) \in R^+} U(t, x, 0) = c \inf_{(t,x) \in R^+} u(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is the constant for the Harnack inequality of Chiarenza–Serapioni [6], so it depends only on dimension, s and the geometry. As $\tilde{U}$ is locally Hölder continuous, so is u . $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Let u be as in the statement and consider its extension U as in Theorem 1.7. As in the previous proof, $U = U(t, x, y) \geq 0$ for $-2 < t < 2$, $x \in B_2$ and $y > 0$, and its reflection $\tilde{U}$ is a nonnegative weak solution to (5.2) in $(-2, 2) \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. We also have that $\tilde{U}(t, x, y)$ vanishes continuously in $(-2, 2) \times ((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \cap B_2) \times \{0\}$, because in that set it coincides with u .

The first step is to flatten the boundary of Ω inside B_2 by using a bilipschitz transformation that can be extended as constant in t and y . We can assume without loss of generality that the flat part of the upper half ball $\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_2$ is the flat part of the new domain $\Omega^{(1)}$. Then the transformed solution $\tilde{U}^{(1)}$ satisfies now the same type of degenerate parabolic equation with bounded measurable coefficients in $(-2, 2) \times (\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_2) \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $\tilde{U}^{(1)}$ vanishes continuously on $(-2, 2) \times (\mathbb{R}_-^n \cap B_2) \times \{0\}$.

Next we take a transformation that maps $(x', x_n, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{x_n \leq 0, y = 0\}$ into the half space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \cap \{x_n > 0\}$ and is extended to be constant in t . The construction of this transformation is by now standard, for details see for example [3] or [16]. After this transformation is performed, we obtain a function $\tilde{U}^{(2)}$ that solves again a degenerate parabolic equation with bounded measurable coefficients and A_2 -weight for $(t, x, y) \in (-2, 2) \times (\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_2) \times \mathbb{R}$ and vanishes continuously for $(t, x, y) \in (-2, 2) \times (\partial\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_2) \times (-2, 2)$.

We can apply the boundary Harnack inequality of Ishige [9] (or Salsa [17] in the case $s = 1/2$) to $\tilde{U}^{(2)}$ and the conclusion follows by transforming back to u . Indeed,

$$\sup_{(-1,1) \times (\Omega \cap B_1)} u(t, x) = \sup_{(-1,1) \times (\mathbb{R}_+^n \cap B_1)} \tilde{U}^{(2)}(t, x, 0) \leq C \tilde{U}^{(2)}(t_0, \tilde{x}_0, 0) = C u(t_0, x_0),$$

where $\tilde{x}_0$ is the point obtained from x_0 after the two transformations above are applied. $\square$

6. HÖLDER AND SCHAUDER ESTIMATES

In this last section we prove Theorems 1.14, 1.15 and 1.17.

6.1. Parabolic Hölder spaces and the Poisson semigroup. Parallel to the elliptic case, see [20, Chapter V], the subordinated Poisson semigroup, $P_y \equiv e^{-yH^{1/2}}$, $y > 0$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_y u(t, x) &:= \frac{y}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} e^{-\tau H} u(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{3/2}} \\ &= \frac{y}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-(y^2+|z|^2)/(4\tau)}}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} u(t-\tau, x-z) dz \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to the case $s = 1/2$ in the extension problem (see Theorem 1.7). If u is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ then $w(t, x, y) \equiv P_y u(t, x)$ is an L^2 solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w = \Delta w + w_{yy}, & \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y > 0, \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} w(t, x, y) = u(t, x), & \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}). \end{cases}$$

The first key statement is the following.

Theorem 6.1 (Parabolic Hölder spaces and growth of Poisson semigroup). *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. Suppose that $u = u(t, x)$ is a bounded function on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then u is in the parabolic Hölder space $C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ if and only if there exists a constant C such that*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y u(t, x) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-1+\alpha},$$

for all $y > 0$. Moreover, if C_1 is the infimum of the constants C above then $C_1 \sim [u]_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}}$.

Next, for $\alpha > 0$ we let $k = [\alpha] + 1$, the smallest integer bigger than α . Motivated by Theorem 6.1 we define the space of functions

$$\Lambda^\alpha \equiv \Lambda_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha} := \left\{ u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) : \left\| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial y^k} P_y u(t, x) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-k+\alpha}, \text{ for } y > 0, \text{ for some } C \right\},$$

under the norm $\|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} := \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + C_1$, where C_1 is the infimum of the constants C appearing in the definition above.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.*

(1) *Suppose that $0 < \alpha < 2$. Then $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$(6.1) \quad |u(t-\tau, x-z) + u(t-\tau, x+z) - 2u(t, x)| \leq C(\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha,$$

for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. In this case, if C_2 denotes the least constant C for which the inequality above is true, then $\|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} + C_2 \sim \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + C_2 \sim \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha}$.

- (2) Suppose that $0 < \alpha < 2$. Then $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ if and only if $u(\cdot, t) \in \Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u(x, \cdot) \in \Lambda^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})$ uniformly on x and t , where the spaces $\Lambda^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\Lambda^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})$ are the classical Zygmund spaces defined in the usual way, see [20, p. 147].
- (3) Suppose that $\alpha > 2$. Then $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ if and only if

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} P_y u(t, x) \in \Lambda^{\alpha-2}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} P_y u(t, x) \in \Lambda^{\alpha-2}.$$

In this case we have the equivalence

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \sim \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} P_y u(t, x) \right\|_{\Lambda^{\alpha-2}} + \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} P_y u(t, x) \right\|_{\Lambda^{\alpha-2}}.$$

- (4) In particular, we have the following equivalences.

- (i) For $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\Lambda^\alpha = C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (ii) For $1 < \alpha < 2$, $\Lambda^\alpha = C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2, 1+(\alpha-1)}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (iii) For $2 < \alpha < 3$, $\Lambda^\alpha = C_{t,x}^{1+(\alpha/2-1), 2+(\alpha-2)}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (iv) For $k < \alpha < k+1$, $\Lambda^\alpha = C_{t,x}^{[k/2]+(\alpha/2-[k/2]), k+(\alpha-k)}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (v) When $\alpha = 1$, $\Lambda^1 = \Lambda_{t,x}^{1/2, 1}$, which is the class of functions that are 1/2-Hölder in time and 1-Zygmund in space, see (6.1). This space contains the space $C_{t,x}^{1/2, 1}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ of 1/2-Hölder continuous functions in t and Lipschitz continuous functions in x .
- (vi) When $\alpha = 2$, $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda_{t,x}^{1, 2}$, which is the class of functions u that are Lipschitz in time and have gradient $\nabla_x u$ in the 1-Zygmund space.

We will present the proofs of these two results in Subsection 6.5.

6.2. Hölder estimates. It can be checked by using the Cauchy Integral Theorem that for $0 < s < 1$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^s = \frac{1}{c_s} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}} - 1)^{[2s]+1} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}},$$

where $[2s]$ denotes the integer part of $0 < 2s < 2$, and

$$c_s = \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau} - 1)^{[2s]+1} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}}.$$

With this, parallel to the case $e^{-\tau H}$, we can write

$$(6.2) \quad H^s u(t, x) = \frac{1}{c_s} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\tau H^{1/2}} - I)^{[2s]+1} u(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.14. In view of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, it is enough to show that if $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ and $2s < \alpha$ then $H^s u \in \Lambda^{\alpha-2s}$ and there exists a constant C such that

$$\|H^s u\|_{\Lambda^{\alpha-2s}} \leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha}.$$

Assume first that $0 < s < 1/2$, so $[2s] = 0$. For any $\alpha < 1$ we have $P_y u \rightarrow u$ uniformly. Indeed,

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |P_y u(t, x) - u(t, x)| &= \left| \frac{y}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} (e^{-\tau H} u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{3/2}} \right| \\ &\leq C y \int_0^\infty e^{-y^2/(4\tau)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(4\tau)}}{\tau^{n/2}} |u(t - \tau, x - z) - u(t, x)| dz \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{3/2}} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^\alpha, \quad \text{for every } (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y (H^s u)(t, x) \right| &= \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y \left(\frac{1}{c_s} \int_0^\infty (P_\tau u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right) \right| \\ &\leq C_s \left\{ \int_0^y + \int_y^\infty \right\} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y (P_\tau u(t, x) - u(t, x)) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the semigroup property we can estimate the first integral above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^y \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial}{\partial r} P_r u(t, x) dr \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} &\leq \int_0^y \int_0^\tau \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \nu^2} P_\nu u(t, x) \right|_{\nu=y+r} \left| dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right. \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_0^y \int_0^\tau (y+r)^{-2+\alpha} dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&= C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha} \int_0^y \int_0^{\tau/y} (1+r)^{-2+\alpha} dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha} \int_0^y \left(\frac{\tau}{y} \right) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} = C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha-2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the second integral is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_y^\infty \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y P_\tau u(t, x) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} + \int_y^\infty \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y u(t, x) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_y^\infty (y+\tau)^{-1+\alpha} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} + C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_y^\infty y^{-1+\alpha} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha-2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now assume that $1/2 \leq s < 1$, so $[2s] = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.4) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y (H^s u)(t, x) \right| &= \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y \left(\frac{1}{c_s} \int_0^\infty (P_{2\tau} u(t, x) - 2P_\tau u(t, x) + u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right) \right| \\
&\leq C_s \left| \left\{ \int_0^y + \int_y^\infty \right\} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y (P_{2\tau} u(t, x) - P_\tau u(t, x)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right| \\
&\quad + C_s \left| \left\{ \int_0^y + \int_y^\infty \right\} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y (P_\tau u(t, x) - u(x, t)) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the semigroup property we can estimate the first integral in the first term above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^y \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y \int_\tau^{2\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} P_r u(t, x) dr \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} &\leq \int_0^y \int_\tau^{2\tau} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \nu^2} P_\nu u(t, x) \right|_{\nu=y+r} \left| dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \right| \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_0^y \int_\tau^{2\tau} (y+r)^{-2+\alpha} dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&= C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha} \int_0^y \int_{\tau/y}^{2\tau/y} (1+r)^{-2+\alpha} dr \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha} \int_0^y \left(\frac{\tau}{y} \right) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} = C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha-2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the second integral in the first term above is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_y^\infty \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y P_{2\tau} u(t, x) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} + \int_y^\infty \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y P_\tau u(t, x) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_y^\infty (y+2\tau)^{-1+\alpha} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} + C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_y^\infty (y+\tau)^{-1+\alpha} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1+2s}} \leq C \|u\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{-1+\alpha-2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term in (6.4) we proceed as in the case $[2s] = 0$. □

6.3. The Poisson problem.

We present the proof of Theorem 1.15.

Proof of Theorem 1.15. The first identity for u in the statement follows by multiplying the following formula with the Gamma function

$$(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^{-s} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-t(i\rho + |\xi|^2)} \frac{dt}{t^{1-s}},$$

by $\widehat{f}(\rho, \xi)$ and taking inverse Fourier transform. The second one is obtained by writing the $e^{-\tau H} f(t, x)$ with its kernel, see (2.3). Finally, estimates (1) and (2) are obvious. □

6.4. Schauder estimates. In a similar way as we did for H^s , for any $s > 0$ we have

$$(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^{-s} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\tau(i\rho + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-2s}},$$

so the L^2 solution u to $H^s u = f$ can be written as

$$(6.5) \quad u(t, x) = H^{-s} f(t, x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2s)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\tau H^{1/2}} f(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-2s}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.17. For the first part, it is enough to show that if u solves $H^s u = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ in the sense that $u = H^{-s} f$, and $f \in \Lambda^\alpha$, then $u \in \Lambda^{\alpha+2s}$ and there exists a constant C such that

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda^{\alpha+2s}} \leq C(\|f\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

Indeed, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y u(t, x) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(2s)} \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{y+\tau} f(t, x) \right| \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-2s}} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} \int_0^\infty (y + \tau)^{-1+\alpha} \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-2s}} = C_{s,\alpha} \|f\|_{\Lambda^\alpha} y^{(\alpha+2s)-1}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the second part of the statement, it is enough to show that

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda_{t,x}^{s,2s}} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}).$$

Suppose that $2s < 1$. From Lemma 6.3 (ii) we see that for f bounded we have

$$\left| y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y f(t, x) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_y u(t, x) \right| &\leq C \left| y \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial y} P_{y+\tau} f(t, x) \frac{d\tau}{\tau^{1-2s}} \right| \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} y \int_0^\infty \frac{\tau^{2s-1}}{(y + \tau)} d\tau \\ &= C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} y^{2s} \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{2s-1}}{(1 + r)} dr = C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} y^{2s}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case when $2s \geq 1$ we proceed in a similar way but using now that

$$\left| y^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} P_y f(t, x) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})},$$

which follows from (6.11). $\square$

6.5. Proofs of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2. To prove Theorem 6.1 we need two preliminary lemmas. Observe that $P_y u(t, x)$ can be written as a convolution of u over $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with the kernel

$$(6.6) \quad P_y(\tau, z) = \frac{y}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{e^{-(y^2 + |z|^2)/(4\tau)}}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2} \tau^{3/2}} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(\tau), \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad y > 0.$$

In particular, $P_y(\tau, z) = P_y^{1/2}(\tau, z)$, where $P_y^{1/2}(\tau, z)$ is the fractional Poisson kernel for the extension problem, see (1.7) in Theorem 1.7.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $P_y(\tau, z)$ be the Poisson kernel given by (6.6). We have*

- (i) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} P_y(\tau, z) dz d\tau = 1;$
- (ii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} |\partial_y P_y(\tau, z)| dz d\tau \leq \frac{C}{y},$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} |\partial_{z_i} P_y(\tau, z)| dz d\tau \leq \frac{C}{y}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$
- (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \partial_y P_y(\tau, z) dz d\tau = 0.$

Proof. (i) is easy to check. For (ii), we observe that

$$(6.7) \quad |\partial_y P_y(\tau, z)| \leq C \frac{e^{-(y^2+|z|^2)/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{(n+3)/2}} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(\tau).$$

Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} |\partial_y P_y(\tau, z)| dz d\tau \leq C \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-y^2/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{3/2}} d\tau = \frac{C}{y}.$$

The derivatives with respect to the spatial variables z_i can be handled in a parallel way. (iii) is a consequence of (i) and (ii). $\square$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $u = u(t, x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *There exists a constant A such that*

$$\|\partial_y P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq A y^{-1+\alpha}.$$

(2) *There exist constants B_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ and C_1 such that*

$$\|\partial_{x_i} P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq B_i y^{-1+\alpha}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_t P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C_1 y^{-2+\alpha}.$$

Moreover the infimum of the constants A appearing in (1) is equivalent to the infimum of the constants B_i and C appearing in (2).

Proof. In order to prove that (1) implies (2) we shall follow some of the ideas developed in Stein [20]. The converse can be done with a parallel argument, so the details in that case are left to the interested reader. By using the semigroup property we have

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y \partial x_i} &= \left(\frac{\partial P_{y/2}}{\partial x_i} \right) * \left(\frac{\partial P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{y/2}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2} &= \left(\frac{\partial P_{y/2}}{\partial x_i} \right) * \left(\frac{\partial P_y u(t, x)}{\partial x_i} \right) \Big|_{y/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y^2} = \left(\frac{\partial P_{y/2}}{\partial y} \right) * \left(\frac{\partial P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{y/2}.$$

Hence if we assume that $\|\partial_y P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq A y^{-1+\alpha}$ then by (ii) in Lemma 6.3,

$$(6.9) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial^2 P_y u}{\partial y^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-2+\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\partial^2 P_y u}{\partial y \partial x_i} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-2+\alpha}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|\partial_{x_i} P_y u(t, x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq \|\partial_{x_i} P_y\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq \frac{C}{y} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})}.$$

Then $\partial_{x_i} P_y u(t, x) \rightarrow 0$, as $y \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore

$$\partial_{x_i} P_y u(t, x) = - \int_y^\infty \frac{\partial^2 P_{y'} u(t, x)}{\partial y \partial x_i} dy'.$$

By using the second estimate in (6.9) we get

$$\|\partial_{x_i} P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-1+\alpha}.$$

Analogously, by (6.8) we can get

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} P_y u \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-2+\alpha}.$$

As $P_y u(t, x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_y^2 P_y u(t, x) = \partial_t P_y u(t, x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} P_y u(t, x),$$

we readily see from (6.9) and the previous estimate that $\|\partial_t P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-2+\alpha}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Assume that $u \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. By using (i) in Lemma 6.3 we can write

$$\partial_y P_y u(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \partial_y P_y(\tau, z) (u(t - \tau, x - z) - u(t, x)) dz d\tau,$$

for every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Therefore, by using (6.7) and the regularity of u ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y P_y u(t, x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} &\leq C \|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-(y^2+|z|^2)/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{(n+3)/2}} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha dz d\tau \\ &= C \|u\|_{C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}} y^{-1+\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$. For the converse, suppose that $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ and write (following Stein [20])

$$\begin{aligned} u(t + \tau, x + z) - u(t, x) &= (P_y u(t + \tau, x + z) - P_y u(t, x)) + (u(t + \tau, x + z) - P_y u(t + \tau, x + z)) + (P_y u(t, x) - u(t, x)). \end{aligned}$$

Next we set $y = |\tau|^{1/2} + |z|$. Then, by the Mean Value Theorem and Lemma 6.4, for some $0 < \theta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_y u(t + \tau, x + z) - P_y u(t, x)| &\leq |\partial_t P_y u(t + \theta\tau, x + \theta z)| |\tau| + |\nabla_x P_y u(t + \theta\tau, x + \theta z)| |z| \\ &\leq C(|\tau|^{1/2} + |z|)^{-2+\alpha} |\tau| + C(|\tau|^{1/2} + |z|)^{-1+\alpha} |z| \\ &\leq C(|\tau|^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t + \tau, x + z) - P_y u(t + \tau, x + z)| &= \left| - \int_0^y \frac{\partial P_{y'} u(t + \tau, x + z)}{\partial y'} dy' \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^y \left\| \frac{\partial P_{y'} u(t + \tau, x + z)}{\partial y'} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} dy' \\ &\leq C \int_0^y y'^{-1+\alpha} dy' = C y^\alpha = C(\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate can be made in the third summand above. We conclude that $u \in C_{t,x}^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. $\square$

In order to prove Theorem 6.2 we need a preliminary result.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ and $\alpha > 0$. Let k and l be two integers greater than α . Then the two conditions*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^k P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y^k} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq A_k y^{-k+\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\partial^l P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y^l} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq A_l y^{-l+\alpha},$$

for $y > 0$, where A_k and A_l are some positive constants, are equivalent.

Proof. The reasoning of Lemma 6.4 drives to the fact that the bound condition for the integer k implies the condition for $l = k + 1$. An integration device gives the converse. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.2 (1). We first obtain some estimates for the second derivatives of the kernel $P_y(\tau, z)$. It is not difficult to check that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$(6.10) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} \right| \leq C \frac{e^{-(y^2+|z|^2)/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{(n+4)/2}} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(\tau),$$

for every $(\tau, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $y > 0$. Therefore

$$(6.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \left| \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} \right| dz d\tau \leq \frac{C}{y^2}.$$

Then, by using (ii) in Lemma 6.3, we get

$$(6.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} dz d\tau = 0, \quad \text{for every } y > 0.$$

Also, from (6.10) we have

$$(6.13) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} \right| \leq C \frac{e^{-y^2/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{(n+4)/2}} \leq \frac{C}{y^{n+4}},$$

and

$$(6.14) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} \right| \leq C \frac{e^{-|z|^2/(c\tau)}}{\tau^{(n+4)/2}} \leq \frac{C}{(\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^{n+4}},$$

for $\tau > 0$. We finally notice that

$$(6.15) \quad \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} = \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, -z)}{\partial y^2}.$$

Now we are in position to prove part (1) in Theorem 6.2. Suppose first that u satisfies condition (6.1) with $0 < \alpha < 2$ on the incremental quotients. Then from (6.12) and (6.15) it is possible to write

$$\frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y^2} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \frac{\partial^2 P_y(\tau, z)}{\partial y^2} (u(t - \tau, x + z) + u(t - \tau, x - z) - 2u(t, x)) dz d\tau.$$

Hence, by using (6.13), (6.14) and the hypothesis on u ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 P_y u}{\partial y^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} &\leq \frac{C}{y^{n+4}} \int_{\tau^{1/2} + |z| < y} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha dz d\tau + C \int_{\tau^{1/2} + |z| \geq y} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^{\alpha-n-4} dz d\tau \\ &\leq C y^{-2+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

The last estimate for the first integral above follows by using the change of variables $\rho = \tau^{1/2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tau^{1/2} + |z| < y} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha dz d\tau &= 2 \int_{\rho + |z| < y} \rho(\rho + |z|)^\alpha dz d\rho \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\rho + |z| < y} (\rho + |z|)^{\alpha+1} dz d\rho \leq C y^{\alpha+n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

A parallel reasoning works for the second integral. Thus $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$.

Now we shall see the converse. That is, assume that $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$. We want to prove that condition (6.1) holds. As $u \in \Lambda^\alpha$ then $u \in \Lambda^{\alpha'} = C_{t,x}^{\alpha'/2, \alpha'}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for some $\alpha' < 1$. Remember that we have the uniform convergence $\|P_y u - u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \rightarrow 0$, as $y \rightarrow 0^+$, see (6.3). Moreover, by Theorem 6.1,

$$\|y \partial_y P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 0^+.$$

By using these last two properties we can readily derive the identity

$$u(t, x) = \int_0^y y' \frac{\partial^2 P_{y'} u(t, x)}{(\partial y')^2} dy' - y \partial_y P_y u(t, x) + P_y u(t, x).$$

To prove (6.1) we use the identity above. Hence we are reduced to estimate second order incremental quotients of $P_y u(t, x)$ and its first and second derivatives in y . We will show the computation for the case of $g(t, x) = P_y u(t, x)$, the other cases follow the same path. For $0 < \theta, \lambda < 1$, $-1 < \nu < 1$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &g(t - \tau, x + z) + g(t - \tau, x - z) - 2g(t, x) \\ &= \left[\nabla_x g(t - \theta\tau, x + \theta z) - \nabla_x g(t - \lambda\tau, x - \lambda z) \right] \cdot z - \left[\partial_t g(t - \theta\tau, x + \theta z) + \partial_t g(t - \lambda\tau, x + \lambda z) \right] \tau \\ &\leq |D_x^2 g(t - \nu\tau, x + \nu z)|(\theta + \lambda)|z|^2 + |D_{t,x}^2 g(t - \nu\tau, x + \nu z)|(\theta + \lambda)|z|\tau \\ &\quad + |\partial_t g(t - \theta\tau, x + \theta z)|\tau + |\partial_t g(t - \lambda\tau, x + \lambda z)|\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the reasonings of Lemma 6.4 we have for $y = \tau^{1/2} + |z|$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|g(t - \tau, x + z) + g(t - \tau, x - z) - 2g(t, x)| &\leq C \left[y^{\alpha-2} |z|^2 + y^{\alpha-3} |z| \tau + y^{\alpha-2} \tau \right] \\
&\leq C \left[y^{\alpha-2} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^2 + y^{\alpha-3} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^3 + y^{\alpha-2} (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^2 \right] \leq (\tau^{1/2} + |z|)^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6.2 (2). By choosing $\tau = 0$ and $z = 0$ in (6.1) we get that $u(\cdot, t) \in \Lambda_x^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ uniformly in t and $u(x, \cdot) \in \Lambda_t^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})$ uniformly in x . For the converse observe that, as $\alpha/2 < 1$, by [20, Proposition 9, p. 147] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|u(t - \tau, x + z) + u(t - \tau, x - z) - 2u(t, x)| \\
&\leq |u(t - \tau, x + z) + u(t - \tau, x - z) - 2u(t - \tau, x)| + |2u(t - \tau, x) - 2u(t, x)| \\
&\leq \|u(t - \tau, \cdot)\|_{\Lambda_x^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)} |z|^\alpha + 2\|u(\cdot, x)\|_{\Lambda_t^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})} \tau^{\alpha/2} \leq C(|z| + \tau^{1/2})^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6.2 (3). Assume that $2 < \alpha \leq 4$. We have

$$\|\partial_y^5 P_y u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-5+\alpha},$$

and we get

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^5 P_y u}{\partial y^3 \partial x_i^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-5+\alpha}.$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial^4 P_y u}{\partial y^2 \partial x_i^2} = \int_y^1 \frac{\partial^5 P_{y'} u}{\partial y'^3 \partial x_i^2} dy' + \frac{\partial^4 P_y u}{\partial y^2 \partial x_i^2} \Big|_{y=1}.$$

Hence, for small y we have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^4 P_y u}{\partial y^2 \partial x_i^2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C \int_y^1 (y')^{-5+\alpha} dy' + C \leq C y^{-4+\alpha}.$$

Two more integrations give that $\partial_{x_i}^2 P_y u(t, x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. Then the uniform limit as $y \rightarrow 0^+$ is exactly $\partial_{x_i}^2 u(t, x)$. As $\|P_y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C$, we have that

$$P_{y'} \frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2} \rightarrow P_{y'} \frac{\partial^2 u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2}, \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 0.$$

But

$$P_{y'} \frac{\partial^2 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2} = \frac{\partial^2 P_y P_{y'} u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2}.$$

Hence in the limit,

$$P_{y'} \frac{\partial^2 u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2} = \frac{\partial^2 P_{y'} u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2}.$$

Then

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 P_{y'} \left(\frac{\partial^2 u(t, x)}{\partial x_i^2} \right)}{(\partial y')^2} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\partial^4 P_{y'} u(t, x)}{(\partial y')^2 \partial x_i^2} \right\| \leq (y')^{-4+\alpha}.$$

That is $\partial_{x_i}^2 u(t, x) \in \Lambda^{\alpha-2}$. For the derivative with respect to t we start in an analogous way, then we get

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^5 P_y u}{\partial y^4 \partial t} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C y^{-6+\alpha}.$$

We continue with the obvious changes. Details are left to the interested reader. □

Proof of Theorem 6.2 (4). The statements in (i)–(v) follow from the previous ones. Finally for (vi), which is the case $\alpha = 2$, we proceed as in the proof of part (1) but starting from $\frac{\partial^3 P_y u(t, x)}{\partial y^3}$. □

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Luis A. Caffarelli for pointing out the possibility of proving the boundary Harnack inequality for fractional caloric functions.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Baeumer, M. M. Meerschaert, and J. Mortensen, Space-time fractional derivative operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133** (2005), 2273–2282.
- [2] A. Bernardis, F. J. Martín-Reyes, P. R. Stinga and J. L. Torrea, Maximum principles, extension problem and inversion for nonlocal one-sided equations, arXiv:1505.03075 (2015), 20pp.
- [3] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **32** (2007), 1245–1260.
- [4] L. A. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre, Hölder regularity for generalized master equations with rough kernels, in: *Advances in Analysis: The Legacy of Elias M. Stein*, 63–83, Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [5] L. A. Caffarelli and P. R. Stinga, Fractional elliptic equations, Caccioppoli estimates and regularity, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* (2015), doi:10.1016/j.anihpc.2015.01.004.
- [6] F. Chiarenza and R. Serapioni, A remark on a Harnack inequality for degenerate parabolic equations, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **73** (1985), 179–190.
- [7] C. E. Gutiérrez and R. L. Wheeden, Harnack’s inequality for degenerate parabolic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **16** (1991), 745–770.
- [8] J. Hadamard, Extension à l’équation de la chaleur d’un théorème de A. Harnack, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2)* **3** (1954), 337–346.
- [9] K. Ishige, On the behavior of the solutions of degenerate parabolic equations, *Nagoya Math. J.* **155** (1999), 1–26.
- [10] J. T. Kemper, A boundary Harnack principle for Lipschitz domain and the principle of positive singularities, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **25** (1972), 247–255.
- [11] N. V. Krylov, *Lectures on Elliptic and Parabolic Equations in Hölder Spaces*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **12**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [12] W. R. Madych and N. M. Riviere, Multipliers of the Hölder classes, *J. Functional Analysis* **21** (1976), 369–379.
- [13] R. Metzler and J. Klafter, The random walk’s guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach, *Phys. Rep.* **339** (2000), 1–77.
- [14] J. Moser, A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **17** (1964), 101–134.
- [15] B. Pini, Sulla soluzione generalizzata di Wiener per il primo problema di valori al contorno nel caso parabolico, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **23** (1954), 422–434.
- [16] L. Roncal and P. R. Stinga, Fractional Laplacian on the torus, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* (2015), DOI: 10.1142/S0219199715500339.
- [17] S. Salsa, Some properties of nonnegative solutions of parabolic differential operators, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* **128** (1981), 193–206.
- [18] S. G. Samko, A. A. Kilbas and O. I. Marichev, *Fractional Integrals and Derivatives: Theory and Applications*, Translated from the 1987 Russian original, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Yverdon, 1993.
- [19] L. Silvestre, Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator, PhD Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2005.
- [20] E. M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series **30**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [21] P. R. Stinga, Fractional powers of second order partial differential operators: extension problem and regularity theory, PhD Thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2010.
- [22] P. R. Stinga and J. L. Torrea, Extension problem and Harnack’s inequality for some fractional operators, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **35** (2010), 2092–2122.
- [23] P. R. Stinga and J. L. Torrea, Regularity theory for the fractional harmonic oscillator, *J. Funct. Anal.* **260** (2011), 3097–3131.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, 396 CARVER HALL, AMES, IA 50011, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

E-mail address: `stinga@iastate.edu`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, AND ICMAT-CSIC-UAM-UCM-UC3M, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address: `joseluis.torrea@uam.es`